

1 PHILLIP A. TALBERT
United States Attorney
2 DAVID L. GAPP
Assistant United States Attorney
3 2500 Tulare Street
Suite 4401
4 Fresno, California 93721
Telephone: (559) 497-4000
5 Facsimile: (559) 497-4099

6 Attorneys for Plaintiff
7 United States of America

8 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10

11 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
12 Plaintiff,
13 v.
14 JACOB JACOBSEN,
15 Defendant.

CASE NO. 1:22-CR-00304-ADA-BAM

STIPULATION REGARDING EXCLUDABLE
TIME PERIODS UNDER SPEEDY TRIAL ACT;
FINDINGS AND ORDER

PROPOSED DATE: July 26, 2023
TIME: 1:00 p.m.
COURT: Hon. Barbara A. McAuliffe

16
17 This case is scheduled for a status conference on May 24, 2023, but the parties have agreed to
18 move this hearing to July 26, 2023.

19 Ends-of-justice continuances are excludable only if “the judge granted such continuance on the
20 basis of [her] findings that the ends of justice served by taking such action outweigh the best interest of
21 the public and the defendant in a speedy trial.” 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A). Moreover, no such period is
22 excludable unless “the court sets forth, in the record of the case, either orally or in writing, its reason or
23 finding that the ends of justice served by the granting of such continuance outweigh the best interests of
24 the public and the defendant in a speedy trial.” *Id.*

25 Recently, the Ninth Circuit enumerated a “non-exhaustive” list of seven factors it found to be
26 “relevant” in considering ends-of-justice Speedy Trial Act continuances “in the context of the COVID-
27 19 pandemic.” *United States v. Olsen*, 21 F.4th 1036, 1047 (9th Cir. 2022). That non-exhaustive list
28 includes: (1) whether a defendant is detained pending trial; (2) how long a defendant has been detained;

(3) whether a defendant has invoked speedy trial rights since the case's inception; (4) whether a defendant, if detained, belongs to a population that is particularly susceptible to complications if infected with the virus; (5) the seriousness of the charges a defendant faces, and in particular whether the defendant is accused of violent crimes; (6) whether there is a reason to suspect recidivism if the charges against the defendant are dismissed; and (7) whether the district court has the ability to safely conduct a trial. *Id.*

In light of the societal context created by the foregoing, this court should consider the following case-specific facts in finding excludable delay appropriate in this particular case under the ends-of-justice exception, § 3161(h)(7). When continued, this court should designate a new date for the hearing. *United States v. Lewis*, 611 F.3d 1172, 1176 (9th Cir. 2010) (noting any pretrial continuance must be "specifically limited in time").

Plaintiff United States of America, by and through its counsel of record, and defendant, by and through defendant's counsel of record, accordingly stipulate as follows:

1. By previous order this matter was set for a status conference hearing on May 24, 2023. The Court more recently has invited a continuance of this hearing if counsel do not believe that anything substantial can be accomplished at the currently scheduled hearing.

2. By this stipulation, the parties agree that the next status conference be scheduled for July 26, 2023, and to exclude time between May 24, 2023, and July 26, 2023, under 18 U.S.C. §§ 3161(h)(7)(A) and 3161(h)(7)(B)(i), (ii) and (iv).

3. The parties agree, and request that the Court find the following:

a) A continuance is required to permit appointed counsel to review discovery that has been provided and to review evidence at an FBI office in Ripon, California. Defense counsel has scheduled an appointment for an investigator to review available material on May 23, 2023. Counsel also needs time to consult with the defendant on how the defendant wishes to proceed with this case.

b) The government does not object to the continuance and joins in the request.

c) Based on the above-stated findings, the ends of justice served by continuing the case as requested outweigh the interest of the public and the defendant in a trial within the

original date prescribed by the Speedy Trial Act.

d) For the purpose of computing time under the Speedy Trial Act, 18 U.S.C. § 3161, et seq., within which trial must commence, the time period from May 24, 2023, to July 26, 2023, inclusive, is deemed excludable under 18 U.S.C. §§ 3161(h)(7)(A) and 3161(h)(7)(B)(i), (ii) and (iv) because it results from a continuance granted by the Court at the request of the parties on the basis of the Court's finding that the ends of justice served by taking such action outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial.

4. Nothing in this stipulation and order shall preclude a finding that other provisions of the Speedy Trial Act dictate that additional time periods are excludable from the period within which a trial must commence.

IT IS SO STIPULATED.

Dated: May 9, 2023

PHILLIP A. TALBERT
United States Attorney

/s/ David Gappa
DAVID L. GAPPA
Assistant United States Attorney

Dated: May 9, 2023

/s/ DOUGLAS FOSTER
DOUGLAS FOSTER
COUNSEL FOR
JACOB JACOBSEN,

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

v.

JACOB JACOBSEN,,

Defendant.

CASE NO. 1:22-CR-00304-ADA-BAM

FINDINGS AND ORDER

PROPOSED DATE: July 26, 2023
TIME: 1:00 p.m.
COURT: Hon. Barbara A. McAuliffe

FINDINGS AND ORDER

IT IS SO ORDERED that the status conference is continued from May 24, 2023, to **July 26, 2023, at 1:00 p.m. before Magistrate Judge Barbara A. McAuliffe.** Time is excluded pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A), B(iv).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: May 9, 2023

/s/ Barbara A. McAuliffe
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE